

Planning Comments

From: Dasilva Antonio [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 November 2019 15:30
To: Planning Comments
Cc: Antonio and Bryony Da Silva - Fletcher
Subject: Sevenoaks District Council Planning - Fort Halstead - 19/05000/HYB

Categories: Orange Category

9 Armstrong Close

Fort Halsted

Sevenoaks

Kent

TN147BS

(FAO) Sevenoaks District Council Planning

I am writing with regards to the development of Fort Halstead and the continued changes to the proposed plans, the original development of 450 units on site 57 was subject to reasonable conditions these included the need for the site to be employment led. Recently it has been stated the proposed hotel is to be removed in favour of a further 300 units with the village green being significantly reduced in size, this development now extends far beyond the original footprint. I believe the site should remain employment driven with a balance of suitable housing and business within the current footprint.

Currently the site and surrounding area is subject to an insufficient water infrastructure causing ongoing supply issues, water companies have made multiple requests to Sevenoaks District Council requesting an impact study prior to considering any developments of the site. To date this request has not been appropriately actioned prior to the proposed small developments within the approved area. This should be granted alongside the Water Frame Directive.

Water quality within the site continues to be of very poor quality, with residents left on a regular basis without drinking water due to ongoing contamination, previously in 2018 residents were subjected to 37 weeks without drinking water and a further 4 weeks in 2019. To date no formal confirmation has been provided explaining who will be providing the water supply to both the new development and how this will incorporate the existing water supply to the existing properties.

I have substantial concerns regarding the lack of information in relation to the safe removal of contamination from the site 57, it is essential the plan produces evidence of how the removal of contaminated land and materials will be monitored. Multiple areas of the site are heavily contaminated with depleted uranium, cyanide poison, photo chemicals, oils, acids, metal carbons and anthracite. A number of these contaminants are not consistent with those found usually on industrial sites and I am concerned at the lack of information regarding the safe removal of these contaminants without further contaminating surrounding areas when in such proximity to residential properties.

The plan has failed to consider the development of a slip road at junction 5 of the M25 leading to significant impact on the traffic and land, this shows very little understanding of the area being developed and the impact on the surrounding road networks.

Whilst site 57 is recorded as a brown field site it is of extremely low level and density surrounded by a dense and mature ancient woodland located in an area of outstanding natural beauty and high performing Greenbelt. I would

like to enquire when and why Sevenoaks District Council found it acceptable to remove this land from the Green Belt.

Regarding proposed policy GB1 Development in the Green Belt.

Sevenoaks District Council commissioned ARUP to produce a Green Belt study covering Sevenoaks, site 57 is located in the parcel of land 76 and ranked the third highest performing Green Belt in the total district (101)

The site is located in a very sensitive area of the Green Belt and an area of outstanding natural beauty located near to the London Borough of Bromley. This meets the top tier purposes of the Green Belt (5.6) The ARUP report was produced to identify areas of the Green Belt requiring the highest protection. Any high-density development of the site directly contravenes the report's findings.

Sevenoaks District Council has failed to effectively act on findings produced by the report, they have omitted sites identified in the top tier situated in poor performing Green Belt in favour of those in the lower tier hierarchy and in the highest performing Green Belt.

In reference to policy LA1 Landscapes and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The National Parks and Access to the Country Side Act 1949 granted 40 sites the status of Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in England and Wales. The Kent Downs is one of the 40 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty given the highest protection.

By granting planning permission for 450 home Sevenoaks District Council has contravened exiting policies and an additional 300 will only add to this contravention. The creation of this larger development in an area of outstanding natural beauty greatly exceeds the size of adjacent settlements.

Site 57 contains a substantial are of Ancient Woodland and is home to indigenous wildlife including bats that cannot be relocated. NPPF (172) states substantial consideration should be given to the conservation of existing natural habitats whilst enhancing landscapes and scenic beauty, any building outside of the existing footprint would conflict with the above policy.

The policy clearly states Ancient Woodland and veteran trees are to be protected allowing suitable buffer zones in all proposals, to build a further 300 units would contravene the existing policy damaging the fragile biodiversity of the area.

The size of the development is likely to increase traffic movements to 4000 per day in contradiction to the proposed T1 policy to mitigate adverse travel patterns produced by the new development. Due to the remote and isolated location the site is unable to accommodate with ease the use of bicycles or those looking to travel on foot. The lack of any public transport will require residents to rely on vehicles compounding one of the 14 established Air Quality Management Areas conflicting with policy HE1.

Paragraph 2.4 ST2 indicates all evidence points towards the requirement for smaller dwellings as proposed in the original application. This new proposal would contravene policy ST2 by presenting over development. The proposed density of 60dph would not respect the local character of the area where density is just 15dph resulting in gross overdevelopment.

I believe to make the plan sound the addition of the proposed 300 units should not be included for site 57 and any proposed units should only be built on the original foot-print, in keeping with existing local developments in the surrounding area. The additional units of site 57 extends beyond the original foot-print which was agreed for 450 units.

Regards



Antonio Da Silva



